

**REMARKS**

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

In previous responses, the Applicant canceled Claims 1-28 and 30-33 without prejudice or disclaimer, and added Claims 36-40. In the present response, the Applicant has amended Claim 29. Support for the amendment to Claim 29 includes paragraphs [0003] and [0023] and FIG. 8 of the published application (U.S. Patent Application 20040195684).

Accordingly, Claims 29 and 34-40 are currently pending in the application.

**I. Rejection of Claims 29, 35-37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner continues to reject Claims 29, 35-37 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sridharan *et al.* ("Sridharan")U.S. Patent 6,525,623.

In a telephone conservation with the Examiner on October 24, 2007, the Examiner clarified that the phrase "being free from a semiconductor substrate" formerly appearing in Claim 29 had been interpreted by the Examiner as meaning that no semiconductor substrate was present at all. The Examiner further explained that Sridharan was cited, at least in part, because Sridham's substrate is a ceramic substrate and not a semiconductor substrate. Therefore, the structure shown in Sridham's FIG. 9 was "free" of a semiconductor substrate.

In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 29 to clarify that the first surface of the dielectric layer is separated from an underlying semiconductor substrate.

The Applicant submits that, as suggested in paragraph [0003] of the application, one skilled

in the art would understand that an RF component that is separated or released from a substrate e.g., by a conventional backside etch through a window in the substrate, or by the processes of the present invention, does not mean that the substrate is entirely removed. In the present invention, the RF component can be efficiently released from the semiconductor substrate such as discussed in paragraph [0023], such that the RF component is separated from the substrate such as illustrated in FIG. 8.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Sridharan, as applied by the Examiner, does not teach all of the elements recited in independent Claim 29. For instance, Sridharan does not teach a dielectric layer having opposing first and second major surfaces, the first surface being separated from a semiconductor substrate as recited in Claim 29. Moreover, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Sridharan does not teach or suggest a semiconductor substrate. Therefore, Sridharan has not been shown to anticipate independent Claim 29 or claims that depend thereon.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 29, 35-37, and 40.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridharan in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,482,445 to Fjelstad (“Fjelstad”). The Examiner has rejected Claims 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridharan in view of U.S. Patent 5,269,880 to Jolly, *et al.* (“Jolly”). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As established above, Sridharan, as applied by the Examiner, does not teach all of the elements of independent Claim 29. Furthermore, Sridharan does not suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 29. For instance, Sridharan uses a ceramic substrate instead of a semiconductor substrate, and the Examiner has not pointed out where Sridharan suggests the use of a semiconductor substrate. Additionally, the surface in Sridham's FIG. 9 identified by the Examiner as a first surface, is not shown to be separated from an underlying substrate. For instance, layer 204 would be directly on layer 208 in Sridham's power divider device shown in FIG. 9.

The Fjelstad and Jolly do not cure the deficit teachings or suggestions of Sridharan in as much the Examiner does not cite these references for teaching or suggesting the above-discussed elements of Claim 29.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the cited references do not support the Examiner's rejection of Claims 29, and its dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a timely Notice of Allowance for Claims 29, 34-40. It is not believed that any fees are due regarding this matter. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2395.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



Charles W. Gaines  
Registration No. 36,804

Dated: October 31, 2007

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800